REMARKS

Claims 35-41, 44-46, 48-50, 52, 54 and 81 are pending. New claim 81 has been added. Claims 35-37, 39-41, 44-46, 52 and 54 have been amended. Claims 1-34, 42-43, 47, 51, 53, 55-80 have been cancelled.

The examiner rejected claims 35-41, 44-52, 54, 60-66 and 68-80 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6011554 to King in view of U.S. Patent No. 7190351 to Goren.

Although Applicant traverses the examiner's rejection, Applicant has amended the independent claim 35 to advance prosecution and has canceled independent claim 60.

Claim 35 has been amended to make the claim clearer and remove unnecessary language. For example, claim 35 has been amended to delete "different" from "first input signals and to delete reference to "a group of symbols" separate from "first input signals". In addition the word" substantially" has been added in claim 35 before "all the letters" This amendment is supported in the Specification including in paragraph "0715" where "substantially all of the letters" is referred to. Claim 40 has been amended to insert "substantially" in order to conform to this amendment to claim 35.

In addition, the term "alphabet" has been deleted and dependent claim 37 has been amended to conform to this amendment. A further amendment has been made reciting inserting after "wherein the input unit comprises a plurality of keys" the phrase "representing the first input signals to which the letters are assigned, said keys being". This is supported throughout the Specification including in paragraphs 0603-0605 discussing the keys representing the input signals of the input unit to which letters are assigned. Claim 35 has also been amended to recite "such that at least one of the first input signals is associated with more than one letter". The Specification and the drawings is replete with references to keys showing multiple letters.

Further, claim 35 has been amended to delete "the keys of each group arranged in a respective single column". Instead, claim 39 has been amended to recite "two groups of keys are located on opposite sides of a device". Claim 41 has also been amended to recite "the keys of each group are arranged so as to form two columns of keys". Similarly, claim 54 recites "letter keys of each group are arranged so as to form two columns of keys" These amendments are supported in the Specification and drawings including paragraph 0621-0622 and at FIG. 51.

Claim 44 has been amended to recite "all the letters" as claim 35 was before the amendment herein. This is supported in the Specification including at FIG. 45C. Claim 45 has been clarified to refer to groups instead of columns. Claim 46 has been amended to recite "virtual keys", which is supported in the Specification including at paragraphs 0546, 0655, 0687, and 0731. Claim 52 has been amended to change "two of the input signals" to "the letters of the language". New claim 81 recites "letter keys of each group are arranged so as to form two rows of keys". This is supported in the Specification including at paragraph 0698 and FIG. 62a

Amended independent claim 35 is distinguishable over King and Goren. Neither King nor Goren combine a word predictive system with two groups of letter keys, at least one of the keys associated with multiple letters, the keys together comprising substantially all letters of the alphabet, the keys available and actuatable at a given time to trigger the word predictive system and thereby permit blind typing by two fingers, one of each hand.

FIG. 24B and column 21 lines 19-33 of Goren cited by the examiner discloses two columns of keys one of which Goren calls control buttons 504 and the other of which Goren calls secondary selection mechanism 506 or key selection mechanism 506. In contrast to the claimed invention, the user cannot select at any given time all letters of the alphabet. Instead, the user initially can only select the control buttons 504 which are vowels or some other useful subset of letters. Second, the secondary selection keys 506 are not letters but rather function

keys that are replaced by letters once a control key is selected. Goren, at columns 23-24 and thereafter provide an example of this.

In contrast to claim 35, therefore, Goren does not teach two separate groups of keys where the keys comprise letters. Goren also does not teach two separate groups of keys where at least some of the keys comprise groups of letters on each key. Moreover, Goren also does not teach two separate groups of keys spanning substantially the entire alphabet so that the user can actuate substantially any letter of the alphabet at any given time.

In addition, by assigning several letters to at least one of the first input signals, which are represented by keys having letters ("letter keys"), and dividing those letter keys into two groups of keys, applicant reduces the number of letter keys that include substantially all of the letters of a language, and by using a word predictive data entry system, applicant permits an extremely fast blind typing system

It would not be obvious to use any combination of the prior art to yield Applicant's data entry system which allows fast, blind typing for inexperienced typists. Many different data entry systems have been developed, yet none of them achieve the easy and convenient result of fast, blind typing for even inexperienced typists, as Applicant's claimed invention does.

Furthermore, since in Goren the keys do not even have associated therewith multiple letters, it would be unreasonable to combine the single-letter-per-key data entry unit of Goren with the word predictive multiple-letter-per-key data entry system of King, where multiple letters per key necessitates disambiguation. While it may be obvious to *try* to provide faster and easier data input, Goren teaches a completely different way of doing so. In Goren, actuation of a control key (for example A, E, I O, U) representing as single letter triggers presentation on the screen of secondary selection keys showing other individual letters. It is not a word predictive system as in King and it is not "adapted to select a word from a word database responsive to a sequence of first input signals" as in claim 35. Combining Goren's

"control key and secondary selection key" system with the word predictive system of King would be incongruous because they are completely different solutions. Even if one somehow did make such a combination, which would be make no sense, it would still not meet the claim limitations of independent claim 35.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 35-41, 44-46, 48-50, 52, 54 and 81 are distinguishable over the prior art and are now in condition for allowance. The favorable consideration and allowance of claims 35-41, 44-46, 48-50, 52, 54 and 81 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark M. Friedman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,883
Dr. Mark Friedman Ltd.
Moshe Aviv Tower, 54th Floor
7 Jabotinsky Street
Ramat Gan 52520 ISRAEL
Tel: 972-3-6114100
Fax: 972-3-6114101
Email: patents@friedpat.com

Dated: May 29, 2011